

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Official Action dated March 15, 2006 for the above identified patent application.

In response to the Official Action, independent Claim 1 has been revised to include the features of Claims 8, 9, 10, thereby effectively rewriting Claim 10 in independent form as Claim 1.

Independent Claim 12 has been amended to include the features of Claims 17, 18, 19, thereby effectively rewriting Claim 19 in independent form as Claim 12.

Claims 8, 9 and 10 have been cancelled, without prejudice, since the features of these claims are now included in independent Claim 1.

Claims 17, 18, and 19 have been cancelled, without prejudice, since the features of these claims are now included in independent Claim 12.

In the Official Action, Claims 10 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over a combination of Lego (U.S. Pat. No. 4,131,791) in view of Brown (published application 2002 018839), in further view of Watkins (U.S. Pat. No. 3,820,740). In support of the rejection, the Official Action states, in pertinent part, that:

"...Watkins shows a roll stabilization that is provided by utilizing the rotational angular inertia of a stabilized platform of the system for reduce [reducing] the required torque and power of a roll stabilization servo system (column 4 lines 29 - 40)..."

Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure of the Watkins patent does not support the rejection of Claims 10 and 19. More specifically, the portion of the Watkins patent cited in the Official Action, namely Column 4, lines 29 - 40 simply does not teach or suggest roll stabilization provided by utilizing the rotational angular inertia of a stabilized platform of the system for reducing the required torque and power of a roll stabilization servo system, as expressly recited in original Claims 10 and 19, and now included in independent Claims 1 and 12, as revised herein.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 12, as amended herein, are clearly patentable over the prior art applied in the Official Action to reject Claims 10 and 19. The remaining pending dependent claims, which depend directly or indirectly from at least one of the independent claims 1 and 12, are allowable at least for the same reasons as their respective parent independent claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark P. Stone', with a stylized, cursive script.

Mark P. Stone  
Reg. No. 27,954  
Attorney for Applicant  
25 Third Street, 4th Floor  
Stamford, CT 06905  
(203) 329-3355